

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 550

EC 210 602

TITLE Finance Formula. Abstract II: Research & Resources on Special Education.

INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Reston, Va.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Innovation and Development.

PUB DATE Sep 85

CONTRACT 400-84-0010

NOTE 3p.; For the original report on which this extended abstract is based, see ED 254 035.

AVAILABLE FROM ERIC/OSEP Special Project, Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091 (free).

PUB TYPE Book/Product Reviews (072)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administration; *Disabilities; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; *Financial Support; *Full State Funding; Grants; *Special Education

IDENTIFIERS *Funding Formulas

ABSTRACT

This one-page abstract summarizes results of a final report of a federally funded project titled, "An Analysis of State Special Education Finance Formulas." Five major types of formulas were identified: flat grant, minimum foundation program, percentage equalizing, percentage matching, and full state funding of the excess cost of special education. Formula types were evaluated according to the criteria of equity, administrative efficiency, adequacy, objectivity, and flexibility. Findings indicated: the flat grant formula appears to be efficient and objective but has few advantages for the special education program unless funded at a high level; the minimum foundation program is advantageous from a general education perspective but is not sufficiently sensitive, nor provides enough flexibility nor meets the needs of smaller districts; the percentage equalizing formula has the potential for overcoming problems of the minimum foundation program if cost based and funded at a substantial state percentage; the percentage matching formula can provide flexibility, variation with need and price, and neutrality toward placement though low-fiscal capacity local agencies may be disadvantaged; and full state funding of the excess cost of special education is the most advantageous formula for special education, but may not be politically or fiscally feasible. (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ERIC/OSEP SPECIAL PROJECT ON INTERAGENCY INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

RESEARCH & RESOURCES ON SPECIAL EDUCATION

ABSTRACT II
SEPTEMBER 1985

FINANCE FORMULAS

An Analysis of State Special Education Finance Formulas is a 105-page Final Report of a research project funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Programs. Special and general education finance formulas for 1980-81 from each of the 50 states were analyzed. Major characteristics of each special education formula were charted, as well as characteristics describing its relationship to the general education finance formula, the measures of educational need employed by the formula, and the timing of funding distribution.

Five major types of formulas were identified and evaluated by the researcher and a panel of ten experts. The criteria used were *equity, administrative efficiency, adequacy, objectivity, and flexibility*. Results were synthesized into a comprehensive outline of the advantages and disadvantages of each major formula.

FORMULA TYPES

Major types of special education finance formulas were identified as follows:

Flat grant

1. A specified amount per unit of need is allotted. The amount of funding per unit is established by the state, and no provision is made for adjusting the local education agency's (LEA's) allocation according to its fiscal capacity.

Minimum foundation program

2. The state specifies the minimum level of education for which it will be responsible, and establishes the amount it will fund to achieve this level. LEAs are required to levy a uniform tax as their contribution to the minimum program, but may go beyond it if they choose. The state funds the amount needed to bring the local contribution up to the minimum foundation level.

Percentage equalizing

3. The state determines the LEA's level of need and then funds a percentage of this level, adjusted for LEA fiscal capacity.

Percentage matching

4. The state pays a percentage of LEA costs, which are limited only by the LEA's ability to fund its share. Typically, no minimum or upper limits on LEA expenditures are established.

Full state funding of the excess cost of special education

5. The state takes responsibility for the LEA's cost of special education over and above the costs of general education. Unlike the other types of finance formulas, the excess cost formula was developed specifically for special education.

SELECTED FINDINGS

- The flat grant (used in 18 states) and the minimum foundation program (found in 16 states) ranked first and second respectively in frequency of use as special education finance formulas in 1980-81.
- It is suggested that the flat grant formula is efficient and objective, but has few advantages for the special education program unless funded at a high level.
- The minimum foundation program formula is advantageous from a general education perspective. However, it may not be sufficiently sensitive, provide enough flexibility, or meet the needs of smaller districts as well as a cost-based formula.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Council for Exceptional Children operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children under a contract with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

ED 297550

EC 210602

- The percentage equalizing formula has the potential for overcoming the problems of the minimum foundation program, if cost-based and funded at a substantial state percentage.
- The percentage matching formula can provide flexibility, variation with need and price, and neutrality toward placement (i.e., it does not provide financial incentives favoring one kind of special education placement over another). Low-fiscal-capacity LEAs may be disadvantaged by this formula.
- Full state funding of the excess cost of special education is seen as the most advantageous formula for special education, but may not be politically or fiscally feasible.

An Analysis of State Special Education Finance Formulas: Final Report. July 1984. 105 pp. M. David Alexander (Project Director), and Sandra McQuain, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg. Grant No. G008300038, Research in Education of the Handicapped. Available for \$.97 (microfiche) or \$9.15 (hard copy), plus postage, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 3900 Wheeler Ave., Alexandria, VA 22304 (1-800-227-3742). Order ED Number 254 035.

ERIC's Special Project on Interagency Information Dissemination is designed to provide information about research in special education, in particular, research funded by the Division of Innovation and Development, Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. This product was developed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children under contract No. 400-84-0010 with the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. The content, however, does not necessarily reflect the position of OSEP/ED and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.



ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HANDICAPPED AND GIFTED CHILDREN
RESEARCH & RESOURCES ON SPECIAL EDUCATION
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 ASSOCIATION DRIVE, RESTON, VA 22091